

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

7 REGINALD ROBINSON,)

8 Plaintiff,)

9 v.)

10 RENTON CITY JAIL CHIEF MANAGER,
et.al.,)

11 Defendant,)

No. C08-01359-JCC-BAT

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR SANCTIONS**

12 Before the Court is plaintiff's motion for sanctions against defendants. Dkt. 32. The Court has
13 the inherent power to impose sanctions in response to abusive litigation practices. *See Chambers v.*
14 *NASCO, Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32, 43-44 (1991). Plaintiff seeks sanctions on the grounds that on January 14,
15 2009, defendants "using intimidation techniques" tried to force plaintiff "to sign documents to
16 dismiss the claim against them." Dkt. 32 at 1, aff. at 1. Defendants contend that on January 14, 2009,
17 they attempted to serve on plaintiff their motions to dismiss and amend schedule, declaration in
18 support, and proposed order to amend the schedule in this case. Dkt. 36 at 1-2. Defendants state
19 plaintiff refused to sign the documents showing receipt even after defendants told plaintiff that by
20 signing he was only signifying he had received copies of the pleadings, not that he was agreeing to
21 the motions. *Id.* at 2. Defendants further state they did not assault or abuse plaintiff. *Id.* at 3.

22 The record shows that plaintiff signed his motion for sanctions on January 19, 2009 and that it
23 was received by the Court on January 22, 2009. Dkt. 32. On January 14, 2009, defendant's counsel

1 filed a certificate of service stating “I personally tendered to him [the pleading] . . . refused to accept.
2 I left the copy with the correction officer and requested they try to deliver it to plaintiff.” *Id.* at 3.
3 The certification further states: “I corp. Curtis Harris, YDOC #547, received a copy of this document
4 and will try to deliver it to inmate Reginald Robinson today, January 14, 2009.” *Id.*

5 Based on the record herein, the Court concludes that sanctions should not be imposed. The
6 record establishes that defendant attempted to serve the motions to dismiss and amend the scheduling
7 order. Plaintiff interpreted this as an attempt “to manipulate [him] into signing a motion to dismiss.”
8 Dkt. 32 (aff. at 1). The Court finds there is insufficient evidence to find that defendants willfully
9 engaged in misconduct calling for sanctions.

10 For the foregoing reasons, the Court ORDERS that plaintiff’s motion for sanctions is DENIED.

11 The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Order to the plaintiff.

12 DATED this 18th day of February, 2009.

13
14 

15 BRIAN A. TSUCHIDA
16 United States Magistrate Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23